## STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DOCKET NO. 2009-489-E

IN RE:

Application of South Carolina Electric & Gas	
Company for Increases and Adjustments in	PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO SCE&G
Electric Rate Schedules and Tariffs	"RETURN IN OPPOSITION TO THE
	[MY] PETITION TO INTERVENE"

## **FACTS and ARGUMENTS.**

Public Service Commission ("PSC") of South Carolina has a right to use their discretion also to this case. This right is not questioned by SCE&G in their "Return in Opposition..." (Matter ID 221765 dated 2/5/2010)

In their [PSC] Mission Statement and Goals, among many very positive goals in the public interests, there are also stated:

- "• Seek to encourage innovation through the enhancement of Commission processes and the attainment of self-actualization by Commission employees through empowering these employees to carry out their responsibilities and rewarding them for their contribution to the attainment of Commission goals.
- Seek to modify the organizational process of the Commission in such a manner as to provide for the incorporation of project teams to address specific complex short-term issues that arise as a result of the dynamic nature of the utility industry regulated by this Commission.
- Provide an open, accessible and efficient regulatory process which is fair, cost effective and unbiased, while also exploring alternative methods of regulating the entities subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.
- Seek to ensure that the regulatory process results in fair and reasonable outcomes."

Logically and according to facts, my standing right is given at least from two facts: (a) In the name **South Carolina** Electric and Gas Company the rights are given to residents of South Carolina (the state where I reside), (b) the well known fact that the rate change done by such a big company as SCE&G will have direct effect on other electric energy users in the state of South Carolina (SC).

The business of any electric utilities, including these in SC, is to produce electricity then distribute it via the grid. In this area, I am an expert and may use it as a consultant for more than personal interest. At this time I voluntarily represent BYPAS ("Consulting", exists since 1988) so its name may be inserted to the docket. PSC would have much improved the electrical case

review in hearings if discussion will have these energy business basic topics. SCE&G is known as a good education supporter, e.g. in TV programs "Are you smarter that 5<sup>th</sup> grader" and we believe the Company has nothing to hide from SC residents.

Let me guess: Even already, such high number of Protestants would not have influence on a final approval if using such SCE&G salesmen's contra-argument that each increase of rates might create protests from payers' side. Anyway – payers need electricity to survive.

I do not expect that Freedom of Information Act will be here something to be ignored by SCE&G legal staff; instead, SCE&G energy production and distribution staff will enjoy professional review in this docket "E" case. Their names are not present in SCE&G official "Return in opposition ..."

## **CONCLUSION**

As a per se petitioner I do expect PSC to approve my petition especially considering its own interest as a public interest representative which respect facts and to move the hearing to the higher level of professional competency.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Wojcicki 820 East Steele Rd. West Columbia, SC 29170

February 9, 2010

E-mail: joe4solar@aol.com

P.S. I have not received the above letter from SCE&G by mail or e-mail till above date. Let me guess: Scana Corporation has such high power that they may ignore such "court rules" expecting that PSC may anyway abuse their discretion on behalf of the Corporation. Their Certificate of Service states 2/5/2010 as a mailing date. Letters from PSC I usually receive in one day.

## STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DOCKET NO. 2009-489-E

IN RE:

Company for I	South Carolina Electric & Gas ncreases and Adjustments in chedules and Tariffs	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

This is to certify that I, Joseph "Joe" Wojcicki have sent the file / a copy of my
PETITIONER'S RESPONSE TO SCE&G "RETURN IN OPPOSITION... TO THE [MY]
PETITION TO INTERVENE

by a mail and via 1<sup>st</sup> Class US well according to Declar D

by e-mail and via 1<sup>st</sup> Class US mail according to Docket Detail For 2009-489-E received from PSC.

The file (copy) of this Letter is sent to:

bzeigler@popezeigler.com, chad.burgess@scana.com, ldixon@popezeigler.com, matthew.gissendanner@scana.com, mwilloughby@willoughbyhoefer.com,

<u>nsedwar@regstaff.sc.gov</u>, <u>shudson@regstaff.sc.gov</u>, <u>davejen@atlanticbb.net</u>, <u>contact@psc.sc.gov</u>, <u>Allison.Minges@psc.sc.gov</u>,

robgamble@allstate.com, Sue.parrott@palmettogba.com,

By 1<sup>st</sup> class mailed on February 9, 2010

to:

Public Service Commission 101 Executive Center Dr., Suite 100 Columbia, SC 29210

SCANA Corp.
Mail Code C222
220 Operation Way - MC C222
Cayce, SC 29033-3701

820 East Steele Rd. West Columbia, SC 29170

February 9, 2010

E-mail: joe4solar@aol.com